

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/699,732	Applicant(s) HEARN, MICHAEL J.	
	Examiner Binta M. Robinson	Art Unit 1625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Binta M. Robinson. *B.M.R.* (3) Rick Stevens.
 (2) Allan Rotman. *alan L. Rotman SPE* (4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 April 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Stevens agreed to delete the word "which comprises" in line 1 of claim 1 and to add in the phrase "of" in its place. Attorney Stevens agreed to limit R2 to phenyl substituted with 1 to 3 substituents selected from the group consisting of a halogen, a hydroxyl, a methoxy, a benzyloxy, a phenoxy, a trifluoromethyl, an isopropyl, and a thiomethyl group, and to naphthyls and substituted naphthyl groups. Attorney Stevens also agreed that R1 would be limited to H or when taken together with R2 will form optionally substituted carbocyclic groups. Attorney Stevens also agreed to delete the phrase "or a pharmaceutical isomer thereof; or a combination of the same" from claim 1. .